

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA
3

4 Barbara Ruth Cram,
5 Plaintiff
6 v.
7 United States,
8 Defendant
9

2:17-cv-02444-JAD-CWH

**Order Adopting Report and
Recommendation; Denying Pending
Motions as Moot; and Dismissing Case
with Prejudice as Frivolous**

[ECF Nos. 2, 3, 4, 15]

10 Pro se plaintiff Barbara Ruth Cram is back again, this time demanding “a turnkey house
11 on the Hopi home” that “includes maid and gardner [sic].”¹ She also requests “one million more
12 per home [she] asked for to take care of lifetime maid and gardner [sic].”² She seems to demand
13 the “turnkey house on the Hopi home” because her current home has 1000 missing babies that
14 are “gravely injured or dead” that “were kidnapped and brought to be penanced there.”³ She says
15 that while she was sleepwalking she saw “3 to a baby. That’s 3000 people” that went inside her
16 home.⁴ “There are people missing that were in the property prior and some are dead.”⁵ Cram
17 and another unidentified person “left [their] home in ashes and were followed to be killed,”
18

19
20 ¹ ECF No. 12 at 1. She distinguishes in her complaint this case from case no 2:16-cv-02870-
21 JAD-CWH, where I dismissed with prejudice her claims that she and her newborn baby were
22 both stabbed, beheaded, and murdered by “subject[s]” she described as “ventriloquists [that]
23 sound like each other and have white hair,” who “work in corrections,” and are “members of a
24 roving gang.” She further alleged in that case that she “was raped at [her] home 1200 times,
[was] kidnapped daily . . . [and] was shot over 100 times in the head while trying to” file the
case. She requested \$5 million in damages.

25 ² *Id.* (emphasis in original).

26 ³ ECF No. 14 at 1.

27 ⁴ *Id.*

28 ⁵ *Id.* at 1–2.

1 Cram claims that she was raped 1500 times, but she is “only concerned with two rapes for the
2 purpose of rape money in this case” and “will deal with the 1500 at another case.”⁶ She also
3 alleges that she was disemboweled, that it “happened again and again,”⁷ that “she’s a case of
4 engulfment,”⁸ and if I don’t see her, it’s because she’s “engulfed.”⁹

5 Magistrate Judge Hoffman recommends that I dismiss this case as delusional and
6 frivolous and that I deny all pending motions as moot. Judge Hoffman issued his report and
7 recommendation on November 16, 2017, making November 30, 2017, the deadline for filing
8 objections. The deadline has expired and Ms. Cram has not objected. “[N]o review is required
9 of a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation unless objections are filed.”¹⁰ Accordingly,
10 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Magistrate Judge Hoffman’s report and recommendation [ECF
11 No. 15] is **ACCEPTED and ADOPTED**, all pending motions [ECF Nos. 2, 3, 4] are **DENIED**
12 **as moot**, and **this action is DISMISSED with prejudice** as delusional and frivolous.

13 DATED: December 5, 2017.

14 
15 U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 ⁶ *Id.* at 2.

23 ⁷ *Id.* at 3.

24 ⁸ It’s anyone’s guess what Ms. Cram means when she uses the term “engulfment” throughout her
25 complaint supplement.

26 ⁹ *Id.* at 15.

27 ¹⁰ *Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003); *see also Thomas v. Arn*,
28 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003).